DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 419 CE 074 709

AUTHOR	Armstrong, Paul
TITLE	Delivering Modern Apprenticeships. FEDA Paper.
INSTITUTION	Further Education Development Agency, London (England).
ISSN	ISSN-1361-9977
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Further Education Development Agency, Publications Dept., Mendip Centre, Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol BS18 6RG, England, United Kingdom (5.50 British pounds).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
JOURNAL CIT	FEDA Matters; v1 n16 1997
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Apprenticeships; Cooperative Planning; Coordination; Curriculum; *Delivery Systems; *Education Work Relationship; Educational Cooperation; Financial Support; Foreign Countries; National Surveys; *Noncollege Bound Students; Partnerships in Education; Postsecondary Education; Questionnaires; School Business Relationship; Technical Institutes; *Vocational Education; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	General National Vocational Qualif (England); *National Vocational Qualifications (England); *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Modern Apprenticeships, which were introduced in 1994, allow young people in the United Kingdom who do not want to commit to full-time further education the chance to achieve a National Vocational Qualification in their field while continuing in employment. The different models for delivery of Modern Apprenticeships that have been developed in further education were examined in a study of 12 further and higher education colleges delivering one or more Modern Apprenticeships. The sample, which was selected to reflect a cross-section of program sizes, occupational areas, geographic locations, and college settings, represented more than 25 different Modern Apprenticeships. Data on models of delivery, funding matters, partnerships and competition, and progression were collected through two site visits of each college and a questionnaire administered to college representatives. Each college supported more than one delivery scheme. Modern apprentices were employed predominately by small- to medium-sized enterprises. It was concluded that delivery of Modern Apprenticeships could be facilitated by General National Vocational Qualifications. In 75% of colleges, funding was allocated on an outcome basis. (Appended are the numbers of current registrations of modern apprentices on schemes offered by colleges in the project and the study questionnaire.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 419

FEDA Further Education Development Agency

Delivering Modern Apprenticeships

Paul Armstrong

Volume 1 Number 16

FE MATTERS

FEDA paper

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CE 074 709

FEDA Further Education Development Agency

Delivering Modern Apprenticeships

Paul Armstrong

FE MATTERS

FEDA paper

About the author

Paul Armstrong, Lecturer in Adult and Continuing Education, Birkbeck College

Paul Armstrong is an experienced researcher in adult, further and higher education. He has undertaken several projects for FEDA on Youth Training, GNVQs and Modern Apprenticeships.

Published by the Further Education Development Agency
Coombe Lodge, Blagdon, Bristol BS18 6RG
Telephone 01761 462503
Fax 01761 463140 (Publications Department)

Registered charity no: 1044145

Editor: Angela Dewsbury
Designer: Mike Pope

Printed by Blackmore Limited, Shaftesbury, Dorset

ISSN: 1361-9977

© 1997 FEDA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrical, chemical, optical, photo-copying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the copyright owner.

Acknowledgements

FEDA would like to thank the following colleges for taking part in this research:

Alan Smith, **Bradford and Ilkley College**

David Arnold, **Cambridge Regional College**

Alan Glover, **East Birmingham College**

Judith Cubison, **Hastings College**

John Proctor, **Leeds College of Technology**

Kevan Goodwin, **South East Derbyshire College**

Brian Athersmith, Pauline Vaughan, **Stourbridge College**

Maura Walker, **Stroud College**

John Norman, **University College, Suffolk**

Ruth Ellis, **West Hertfordshire College**

Bernard Perry, Martyn Wagner, **Westminster College**

Jane Robinson, **Writtle College**

FEDA is also grateful for the involvement of the members of the project steering group:

Katrina Dougherty, Hertfordshire TEC

Derek Fisher, Government Office South East

Alan Glover, East Birmingham College

Kevan Goodwin, South East Derbyshire College

Rachel Hersh, NCVQ

Ian Lorimer, Telecom Vocational Standards Council

Aidan Pettitt, EDEXCEL (BTEC), now Development Manager at Sussex Enterprise

Peter Swindlehurst, Engineering Council

Paul Armstrong, FEDA project consultant

Simon James, FEDA

Ossie Pereira, FEDA project manager

Contents

Key findings 4

Main issues

1. Focus of this research 7

Research aims

Colleges involved

Methodology

2. Models for delivery 9

Funding

Curriculum

College organisation

Towards models for delivery

3. Funding, partnerships and progression 16

Funding matters

Partnerships and competition

Progression

4. Comparing college profiles 20

One major customer

Direct contract with the TEC

Central co-ordination

Branching out into new areas

Profile analysis: limitations and potential

5. Next steps 25

Areas for further investigation

Bibliography 26

Acronyms 27

Appendices

Appendix 1: Numbers of registrations of modern apprentices in the project colleges 29

Appendix 2: Questionnaire 30

Key findings

- This research has revealed that, across the diversity of provision within the sector, there are nearly as **many models for delivery** as there are Modern Apprenticeships. All 12 colleges taking part support more than one scheme. This reflects the way that a college works flexibly, responding to its organisation and to its partnership relationships, in particular the financial and contractual arrangements with its local Training and Enterprise Council(s) (TEC), the industry lead bodies or Industry Training Organisations (ITOs), local companies, particularly small to medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). (Currently ITOs and lead bodies, along with occupational standards councils, are being rationalised into a single network of National Training Organisations [NTOs] – see Powell, 1996. The first tranche of NTOs to be approved will be announced shortly.)

- All but two of the colleges taking part said that their **modern apprentices were predominately employed by SMEs**. The success of the partnership between the college and TEC(s) varied.

- An important factor in the success of delivery is whether the college has an **internal structure in place** for co-ordinating Modern Apprenticeships centrally – 83% of the participating colleges are organised in this way.

- The research has concluded that **delivery of Modern Apprenticeships could be facilitated by General National Vocational Qualifications (GNVQs)** , but that the evidence shows that not many colleges are making use of this strategy – only one of the participating colleges links any of its schemes to existing GNVQ provision, yet it found that this worked well.

- The **key skills element of does link to GNVQs Modern Apprenticeship schemes**. Evidence shows that other providers often subcontract this aspect to colleges because of their immense experience in offering this provision.

- For 75% of colleges in the project, some of their **funding is allocated on an outcome basis**. For three of the colleges, all of their funding is allocated on this basis. A specific problem related to this became evident from the research: that of poaching. Because it is the organisation with which the apprentice is registered when completing the National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) that receives the outcome funding, some training providers are offering employers or employees incentives to transfer to them just before completion.

- It appears from this research that **modern apprentices are not that concerned to look forward to what they might do once they have completed their apprenticeships**. However, this could be due to the fact that the apprentices involved were in the early stages of their programme. Few appear to be using the scheme as a route into higher education: only one of the colleges said that most of its apprentices would progress in this way. All of the colleges involved are providers of higher education so have an interest in encouraging apprentices to progress to such a programme. When discussing progression, the colleges expressed concern tha unless all modern apprentices achieve key skills to level 3 there may be progression problems, since many HE providers will expect this level of attainment.

Main issues

A number of issues that colleges and other training providers will need to consider when delivering Modern Apprenticeships have emerged from this research.

Funding matters

- Should colleges hold TEC contracts directly or subcontract through other providers, employers or lead bodies?
- How far will colleges be involved in marketing, recruitment and selection?
- How will colleges ensure they identify all modern apprentices registering for training and/or assessment?
- Are colleges able to take risks with outcome funding?
- Could colleges support local SMEs by holding the TEC contract and handling the paperwork?
- Can colleges continue to afford to add value as well as provide value for money for Modern Apprenticeships?
- Will college organisations and structures need to change in response to outcome funding?
- What can colleges do to maximise the number of apprentices completing?

Curriculum concerns

- Does the college intend to provide training and assessment support for Modern Apprenticeships?
- Has the college appropriate resources and facilities to support the Modern Apprenticeship to NVQ level 3?
- Will modern apprentices be accommodated on existing courses or could the college offer them their own programme, whether full-time or part-time day or block release?
- Has the college considered the advantages of integrating the delivery of Modern Apprenticeships into their GNVQ provision?
- Will key skills be integrated in theory and practice?
- Will levels of prior achievement in key skills be measured on entry?
- Will students' achievement of key skills be encouraged through evaluation?
- Will all employers, lead bodies and ITOs recognise the value of key skills, particularly for the future and as part of lifetime learning and continuing professional development?
- Is case study evidence available to convince reluctant employers of the value of key skills?
- Will key skills be 'bolted on' as a transitional arrangement or because contractors require it?

College co-ordination

- Does the college offer a single point of contact for employers and apprentices?
- Can the college present a single, unified interface with the TEC and other funding bodies?
- Can a broad overview of provision in the college be easily obtained?
- Is there overall control of the curriculum?
- Is there evidence of strategic planning and evaluation?
- In any audit process can all information required be found in one place?

- Is there overall control of the quality assurance process?
- Are there health and safety difficulties?
- Will time-sheets and funding claims be administered efficiently and effectively?
- Could liaison and co-ordination, including networking with contractors and other providers, be improved?
- Can contract requirements be easily communicated to departments and staff?
- How far is decision-making and accountability devolved in response to outcome-funded contracts?
- Is a competitive element between central co-ordinators in neighbouring colleges interfering with co-operative networking and partnerships at departmental and course level?
- Are central co-ordinators senior appointments and/or do they have the support of senior management?
- Is the work of central co-ordinators valued as part of the core curriculum, or seen as a marginal activity?

Partnerships

Do training providers:

- find problems with tracking and payments when accommodating apprentices on existing provision?
- expect cheap and quick delivery with little concern for quality?
- agree that collaboration rather than competition is necessary where SMEs are being served, or where two or more colleges are in close proximity?
- provide added value; if so, who pays?
- find the status of key skills uncertain and variable?

Do TECs:

- show variation in terms of funding arrangements, and have unhelpful recording and monitoring systems (especially when colleges have to deal with more than one TEC)?
- have adequate quality assurance procedures – are there examples of good practice?
- require colleges to commit to a high-risk strategy in terms of outcome-funding and end-loaded finances?
- require colleges as training providers to be even more flexible and responsive than they already are?

Generally:

- in partnerships, do colleges believe they suffer from their own 'professionalism'?

Progression

- What is the role of colleges in ensuring progression within the job and into higher education?
- How far has higher education recognised the existence of Modern Apprenticeships as a progression route?
- Is there any evidence of a demand among modern apprentices for progression into higher education?
- Will variations in key skill specification in Modern Apprenticeship frameworks create difficulties for access to higher education in the future?

1. Focus of this research

By October 1996, within three years of their launch, Modern Apprenticeships were available in 57 industry sectors, with a further 15 under development. They offer young people who do not want to commit to full-time further education the chance to achieve an NVQ to level 3 in their field, while continuing in employment. They can also gain key skills and knowledge in other areas considered important within their employment sector, and develop wider skills needed in any workplace.

Apprentices are not tied to achieving the outcome within a given time-scale, although it is expected that most will complete the scheme within three years. Take-up has been strong, with more than 36,000 students beginning a scheme by June 1996. By the end of this project (April 1997), there had been nearly 80,000 starts.

When prototype Modern Apprenticeships were introduced in September 1994, no particular model of delivery was specified. Lead bodies were responsible for providing a framework, but there was much variation between these sector frameworks. This research project offers an opportunity to see which models work best in practice. The snapshot of current provision that it provides, across a cross-section of colleges, can be used to identify best approaches to delivering Modern Apprenticeships within the sector. It focuses on five key areas which influence the mode of delivery adopted: funding matters, curriculum concerns, organisational arrangements, partnerships and progression. This paper considers the strengths of colleges in supporting key skills, and the opportunities for training and assessing in realistic work environments (RWEs), or simulated experience. It considers the model of provision from the point of view of on-the-job assessment services.

Research aims

This project's overall aim was to identify, investigate and evaluate different models for delivery of Modern Apprenticeships developed in further education across a range of occupational sectors. In particular, it would:

- investigate the ways in which the funding regime affects design, development and implementation of these delivery models
- identify factors which facilitate (or hinder) implementation; this would involve looking at the partnerships established, employment opportunities available, and the tradition of apprenticeships within occupational sectors
- investigate the progression routes provided by the different models in each occupational sector
- identify elements of good practice for dissemination.

Colleges involved

A total of 12 further and higher education colleges delivering one or more Modern Apprenticeships were researched for this project. Between them, these colleges cover 25 different Modern Apprenticeships (although not all had registrations at the time of the research, and some have few starts to date). They include 933 apprentices (just more than 4% of the total). A summary is provided in Appendix 1, which also names the colleges involved.

Colleges taking part were chosen to reflect a cross-section of provision. Three of them had been involved in the previous FEDA project evaluating Modern Apprenticeships in the prototype phase. The colleges were selected on the basis of these criteria:

- size of Modern Apprenticeship scheme by number of starts and leavers (as of 13 August 1996)
- diversity of occupational areas
- geographical distribution of colleges, covering urban and rural settings
- nature and type of college – serving different populations and purpose.

Methodology

The 12 colleges were invited to a briefing seminar, to help generate the questions that they would be asked. Each college was then visited towards the end of 1996 and again early in 1997 to collect data on:

- models of delivery
- funding matters
- partnerships and competition
- progression.

Identifying models for delivery of Modern Apprenticeships in FE was a more complex process than originally envisaged. A creative approach was needed to find a methodology for pursuing the analysis in more detail. This involved identifying a range of factors that could influence the models for delivery. Analysis of college interview data generated nearly 50 variations in a number of factors. These were organised into a simple questionnaire, as a checklist of 46 items, which the 12 college representatives were asked to complete at the beginning of the second seminar. The questionnaire (with the total responses for each item) is given in Appendix 2.

At this second and final seminar, the college representatives were then encouraged to reflect on the differences between their responses to the checklist, and to verify the research outcomes. From their discussions, a number of relevant issues emerged as to best practice in the delivery of Modern Apprenticeships.

The short time-span of this project meant it was not possible to pilot the questionnaire. There was also little time to consider issues of reliability and validity. The numbers involved (12) are too small to carry out a sophisticated statistical analysis (such as multiple regression or cluster analysis, to measure the relative significance of each factor). When analysing the responses of the 12 colleges, it is necessary to bear in mind that the profiling questionnaire is a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. It is the subsequent discussion of possible explanations for the patterns revealed that is important.

2. Models for delivery

The research has shown that there are many factors which influence the model of delivery chosen for Modern Apprenticeship schemes and which affect implementation. The level of significance of each will depend upon the perspective in which you are interested: funding, curriculum or organisation. To make the picture more complex, many of the factors have underlying issues.

Funding

From the point of view of funding, there are two models for delivery based on:

- a direct contract between the college and the TECs
- subcontracts through other training providers (including ITOs).

From the college's point of view, there are financial advantages to holding the TEC contract directly, rather than being subcontracted by an employer, an ITO, such as the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB), or another training organisation (private or public). However, where that funding is based on outcomes, colleges would at least avoid carrying the financial risk if they are subcontracted – unless the contract holders decide to offer, in turn, outcome-related funding. There is no evidence of this among the project colleges.

Recruitment and marketing

Another related issue concerns who controls delivery, and who recruits for the programme. In a subcontract relationship, the college is in the role of supplier of services (which may be curriculum delivery, including key skills, and/or assessment); the contract holder is the customer. In this instance, the college might have little influence on recruitment and selection. However, the evidence suggests that advice from colleges on the suitability and potential of apprentices as candidates for achievement of the minimum NVQ level 3, together with appropriate key skills, is often taken seriously, since it is in everyone's interest that apprentices succeed. The research did not collect data on entry criteria, mainly because recruitment was generally not the responsibility of the colleges. Where colleges do participate in the recruitment process, they have clear criteria on prior academic achievements, and are aware of appropriate diagnostic tests that will identify the current level of prospective students, and their likelihood of succeeding on the scheme.

There is also evidence that colleges are recommending to local employers students who leave the college having completed an appropriate programme, on the basis that they have the potential to succeed on a Modern Apprenticeship scheme. Where employers are unaware of the scheme, and have sent some of their employees to the college for day or block-release training, colleges may recommend that these students transfer to a Modern Apprenticeship.

Marketing is usually undertaken by the TECs, which not only advertise in the local media but use a variety of events involving employers and parents to promote Modern Apprenticeships. Not all of the participating colleges were satisfied with the marketing, and a number use their own publicity, prospectuses and advertising to promote the schemes they offer.

Other factors

Some employers receiving funds for training modern apprentices allow, and even encourage, their students to sign on at the local FE college for appropriate vocational training, without declaring their status as modern apprentices. This is one reason why the figures in Appendix 1 are likely to be an underestimate of the actual numbers of modern apprentices registered in FE colleges. The advantage of this to the employer is that their apprentices may be placed on programmes subsidised by FEFC funding, and so they will not have to pay the full cost, for which they have been given funding. Despite these issues, holding TEC contracts does not necessarily simplify the situation for colleges. In cases where colleges have to deal with more than one TEC (colleges in the West Midlands, for example, might have to deal with as many as 15), it

quickly becomes apparent that TECs do not take a uniform approach to either funding or contracting for the scheme.

Funding and contracts based on numbers of starts or action plans, and involving weekly payments, are quite different from outcome funding that pays 25% up front, and the remaining 75% when apprentices have achieved NVQ level 3 and the specified key skills. This could represent a minimum of three years' investment for colleges. The quantity and range of paperwork adds to the variability.

It is not clear whether funding is dependent upon successful completion of a Modern Apprenticeship, which is seen as a scheme, or the achievement of NVQ level 3, a qualification. For example, if an apprentice completes NVQ level 3 in construction, but has not addressed key skills according to the Modern Apprenticeship framework, is she deemed successful? Does the college receive the remaining 75% funding? At least one lead body appears to be planning to issue a Modern Apprenticeship certificate to apprentices who meet *all* the requirements of their framework, and not just those for NVQ level 3.

Control over the curriculum

Although NVQs are nationally-set standards, the mode of delivery is unspecified, and gives much flexibility in how the standards are achieved, and within what time span. In a direct contract situation, the colleges have negotiating power with their local TEC. They may be able to persuade the TEC that to provide a quality outcome requires a certain number of training and assessment hours over a period of time, at a given price necessary to cover costs. In the other relationship, the contract holder may offer the subcontract at a fixed price, which means the college has to determine the amount of resource and the degree of quality it can put into meeting the contract requirements. The college may have to deliver to a lower standard if its tender is to be competitive.

Section 3 looks at other funding issues related to Modern Apprenticeships.

Key considerations on funding

- **Should colleges hold TEC contracts directly or subcontract through other training providers, employers or lead bodies?**
- **How far will colleges be involved in marketing, recruitment and selection?**
- **How will colleges ensure they can identify all modern apprentices registering for training and/or assessment?**
- **Are colleges able to take risks with outcome funding?**

Curriculum

Evidence from this research shows that for some colleges their sole input to programmes is to provide assessment and review.

For example, one business administration programme has no college provision for training since this is undertaken through work-based learning (although it does offer open and flexible learning for apprentices struggling with underpinning knowledge, or – more often – key skills).

In one participating college, a Modern Apprenticeship in information technology is entirely work-based, requiring no attendance at college.

At the other end of the spectrum, some programmes (for example, one in electrical installation and another in engineering manufacture) require apprentices to spend their first year in employment in off-the-job training at the college. In between are other modes of delivery, including the traditional day-release and block-release provision.

The pattern of curriculum delivery depends upon the college organisation and on contractual arrangements, but is also subject to variations due to the nature of the occupational programme.

In hairdressing, for example, as the programme progresses through the NVQ levels more off-the-job training is required. This is because the amount of underpinning knowledge increases, and the basic skills and techniques have been acquired through work experience. For one college this proved to be a deterrent for young hairdressing trainees progressing from NVQ

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

level 2 on to the Modern Apprenticeship scheme; after two years' further education they consider themselves fully trained, and want to just get on and do the job, without having to undertake further study outside of work hours.

Interest levels

Level of interest in particular programmes is another influencing factor. Sometimes there are sufficient numbers to run Modern Apprenticeship programmes. For example, within the participating colleges there are schemes specifically for Modern Apprenticeships in electrical installation, construction and plumbing (multi-skills). For the first two, the programmes are provided under subcontractual arrangements with the CITB and Joint Training Limited (JTL); in the third, the majority of the apprentices are employed by a local authority. However, it is more common to accommodate apprentices on existing provision.

As can be seen from Appendix 1, in a few of the colleges taking part there are almost as many schemes as there are modern apprentices. (Given that some programmes have yet to recruit, it is possible to have more schemes than apprentices.) Inevitably, this means that the apprentices are being trained in the workplace, or through open and flexible learning arrangements, or they have to join students on other qualification routes and/or modes of delivery.

Resource availability

Certain occupational areas have a tradition of apprenticeships. Areas with the most modern apprentices are engineering manufacture, hairdressing, motor vehicle maintenance, and electrical installation. Together these make up a high proportion of all apprenticeships.

However, business administration, which does not have a tradition of apprenticeships, has the second highest number of Modern Apprenticeship starts (after engineering manufacture). Accessibility of NVQs to level 3 and beyond and whether colleges provide secretarial and administrative skills training will be the main factors influencing mode of delivery for a business administration apprenticeship. Colleges either have the resources to support this training, or – as in the case of one of the participating colleges – are able to assess to NVQ standards almost entirely within the workplace.

The notion of RWEs is not new in further education. Colleges have run training restaurants as business enterprises for a while now, and several have hairdressing and beauty salons.

Colleges with an RWE will find it more profitable and less risky to deliver training and assessment for modern apprentices. In some vocational areas – such as hairdressing, electrical installation, motor vehicle maintenance, wool textiles, print, and construction – colleges can offer workshop facilities that modern apprentices might not otherwise have in their workplace.

Although there is general disapproval of assessing NVQ students via simulations using college-based facilities and resources, realistically many candidates would not be able to submit a portfolio if they were not able to gain evidence from this means. In some areas, such as wool textiles, the college facilities are far better than those available in local industries. Some colleges hold demonstration machinery or computer software and equipment for local manufacturers to examine and try out before buying their own.

Resource availability is an issue. Colleges must optimise the facilities they have. At least two of the participating colleges have three intakes of modern apprentices over as many years, so need to schedule the use of resources and facilities to ensure that they are used to full potential, without creating conflict with other programmes requiring access.

Links with other programmes

The relationship of Modern Apprenticeships with other programmes, including GNVQs, was one feature of the curriculum examined in the project. Given that NVQs should invariably be delivered through the workplace, not through attendance at a further education institution, it has been suggested that the sector's delivery of Modern Apprenticeships could be facilitated by

GNVQs. However, beyond engineering manufacture being provided by one of the colleges in partnership with Rover and SMEs, there is little evidence from this research of this taking place. In some cases, overlap with GNVQs has been recognised; for example, some units of the GNVQ business administration were being used in an accountancy Modern Apprenticeship, but have now been taken out.

In other schemes, GNVQs are integrated into the model of delivery for the Modern Apprenticeship, and in others they are delivered by industrialists. If GNVQs are not integrated in Modern Apprenticeship schemes, progression from a GNVQ to becoming a modern apprentice is problematic because the learning processes and outcomes are different. In terms of career progression such a move would also be unnecessary, since students can move from a GNVQ into employment or into higher education, following an alternative (academic) route.

One college had considered using some GNVQ engineering units, but decided against it because it concluded that industry needs young people with hands-on experience and skills, not a GNVQ. Another reported that delivering Modern Apprenticeships through GNVQs would be a problem as all its GNVQs, apart from Leisure and Tourism, were full-time. This may not be a general issue since in one or two apprenticeships employers are happy for the entire first year to be full-time attendance at the local FE college. One college that did base its Modern Apprenticeship training and assessment on GNVQs reported that these concerns are unfounded, and that GNVQs work particularly well for them. Similar concerns apply to those studying for more traditional vocational qualifications (for example, BTEC National Diplomas). In one college, the engineering department offers an apprenticeship programme, based on one-year block-release, leading to a Business and Technology Education Council [BTEC] National Diploma. As such, the local TEC will not fund it and integrating it into the Modern Apprenticeship scheme is problematic (it is part-funded through the TEC and through support from a local association of engineering employers).

Those most likely to progress to Modern Apprenticeships are students from Training Credit or National Traineeship programmes with NVQ level 2. Colleges which run such schemes have been able to encourage students progressing to a job to persuade their employers to allow them to become modern apprentices. However, this has proved difficult in at least three vocational areas, hairdressing, catering and construction, where there is a big leap from NVQ level 2 to level 3. This reinforces the view that some of the problems of Modern Apprenticeships – in this case of consistency and coherence of levels within the framework – are more a reflection of the NVQs on which they are built.

Key skills

One aspect of the curriculum which does link to GNVQs is the key skills element of the Modern Apprenticeship schemes. These have been added to the requirement to achieve a minimum of NVQ level 3 in the vocational standards as an afterthought. Although some ITOs offer their own version of key skills, colleges have had substantial experience of providing what are now called key skills (previously referred to as life and social skills, core skills and common skills). Many colleges have extended their provision beyond those programmes that demand it (for example, GNVQs). Evidence suggests that other Modern Apprenticeship providers are struggling in this area, and are subcontracting this aspect to colleges.

Much attention has been given to mapping and creating assignments that deliver occupational competence and key skills, even though they may now need separate assessment. Another problem relates to variations, particularly in levels, between different Modern Apprenticeships. For example, in hairdressing key skills are required at level 3, except IT skills which are not seen to be necessary beyond level 1. Such variations may be inevitable, and an aspect of the flexibility of the scheme. However, they could become a barrier to access into higher education, if HE providers assume that all modern apprentices have achieved all key skills to a minimum of level 3.

FE colleges have substantial expertise in delivering key skills and some have even centralised their provision via open learning centres or learning support centres. However, this may mean that key skills are seen as 'add-ons' to the vocational programmes. Research has shown that key skills are more likely to be achieved if delivered through the vocational training, not in addition to it.

Key considerations on curriculum issues

- Does the college intend to provide training and assessment support for Modern Apprenticeships?
- Has the college appropriate resources and facilities to support the Modern Apprenticeship to NVQ level 3?
- Will modern apprentices be accommodated on existing courses or could the college offer them their own programme, whether full-time or part-time day or block release?
- Has the college considered the advantages of integrating the delivery of Modern Apprenticeships into their GNVQ provision?
- Will key skills be integrated in theory and practice?
- Will levels of prior achievement in key skills be measured on entry?
- Will students' achievement of key skills be encouraged through evaluation?
- Will all employers, lead bodies and ITOs recognise the value of key skills, particularly for the future and as part of lifetime learning and continuing professional development?
- Is case study evidence available to convince reluctant employers of the value of key skills?
- Will key skills be 'bolted on' as a transitional arrangement or because contractors require it?

College organisation

Evidence from this research shows that colleges which contain a semi-autonomous organisation, perhaps formerly a youth training or employment training agency, are more likely to achieve central co-ordination of their Modern Apprenticeships. This unit or organisation will also be the interface between the college and the local TEC. It will vary in size and nature from college to college and will perform differing functions. Those with previous involvement in Employment Department and TEC schemes may be better placed to handle contractual negotiations with the TEC, and to provide the liaison support for assessment and review. In some cases, the functions are performed by individuals – such as the Training Schemes Co-ordinator, TEC Liaison Officer, Jobskills Manager – rather than an organisation, and these responsibilities are sometimes in addition to other college roles.

Colleges without central co-ordination often have departments dealing directly with contractual, curriculum and assessment matters relating to their Modern Apprenticeships. Typically, such arrangements are more feasible when the contract is a subcontract with another training manager or an industry lead body, rather than with the TEC. One college faculty is appointing an administrator specifically to handle liaison with the TECs.

Co-ordinating Modern Apprenticeships is not just about dealing with financial negotiations and procedures. Responding to the needs of local employers, training managers and TECs involves curriculum issues and assessment and review procedures. In one college, the central co-ordinator reported that Modern Apprenticeships could be provided for local retail employers, but the attitude of the relevant college department was a barrier. In another college, with a training agency, a department had the autonomy to extend its provision and develop new areas: when approached by a training organisation to provide underpinning knowledge for an apprenticeship scheme in painting and decorating, it was able to respond quickly, secure the contract, and begin training before all the equipment and resources (including staff) were in place.

Extending provision

An ability to respond positively to demands is another feature of successful delivery. At least one college reported that it attempts to do this, and felt that the FE sector had been preparing to be flexible and responsive. However, most colleges would not consider offering a Modern Apprenticeship scheme in a vocational area in

which they did not already provide training. One college asked by their TEC to provide a scheme in Estate Agencies declined because they knew they would have to invest heavily to establish it and, from what they knew about the local estate agency network, they would probably be unable to sustain the programme for more than one year.

Another college reported that because it did not provide retail training, it passed on any requests for such supply to known local providers.

The college must be aware of the local economy to take such decisions. In one case, the local TEC was offering pump-priming payments to get programmes started, and this did encourage the college to consider extending into new areas.

Colleges should also be aware of the Modern Apprenticeship framework for each industry, since not all are deemed to be realistic. For example, one college, after due consideration, decided not to offer Modern Apprenticeships in information technology because it felt they would be impossible to deliver within a reasonable time and within given resources.

Resource implications

Extending, or even expanding, provision has staffing implications. Typically, colleges have been through a period of rationalisation and reducing the diversity of their provision to manage their budgets.

The college may have to take on new staff before it can tender for contracts from TECs to train modern apprentices. This may be through recruiting part-time staff, staff on short-term and/or temporary contracts, or staff on lower salary scales and different conditions of service than lecturing staff.

The composition of staff working in colleges may already be changing, and the needs of modern apprentices may exacerbate this change. The college responding to the demand for a painting and decorating Modern Apprenticeship, for example, intends to take on a workshop manager, who will also help with its electrical installation programme. Another college uses instructors alongside lecturers in their engineering workshops. Some colleges have realised that using lecturers for workplace and competence assessment is often an expensive solution, and that it may be cheaper to appoint part-time or even consultant-trained assessors; alternatively, they might employ full-time assessors, but as technicians. The research has revealed that colleges recruit for a wider range of jobs, and that these staff are working effectively in teams, with a flatter management hierarchy.

Key considerations for co-ordinating schemes

- **Does the college offer a single point of contact for employers and apprentices?**
- **Can the college present a single, unified interface with the TEC and other funding bodies?**
- Can a broad overview of provision in the college be easily obtained?
- Is there overall control of the curriculum?
- **Is there evidence of strategic planning and evaluation?**
- In any audit process can all information required be found in one place?
- Is there overall control of the quality assurance process?
- Are there health and safety difficulties?
- Will time-sheets and funding claims be administered efficiently and effectively?
- Could liaison and co-ordination, including networking with contractors and other providers, be improved?
- Can contract requirements be easily communicated to departments and staff?
- How far is decision-making and accountability devolved in response to outcome-funded contracts?
- Is a competitive element between central co-ordinators in neighbouring colleges interfering with co-operative networking and partnerships at departmental and course level?
- Are central co-ordinators senior appointments and/or do they have the support of senior management?
- Is the work of central co-ordinators valued as part of the core curriculum, or seen as a marginal activity?

Towards models for delivery

The features identified above can all contribute to the model of delivery that a college develops to respond not only positively and flexibly, but efficiently and effectively to Modern Apprenticeships. Given the number and nature of these dimensions, it is difficult to identify a simple set of models from the 12 colleges involved in this project. Each college will have a unique response, and, to add to the complexity, this may vary within different parts of the college depending upon the nature of the occupational area, the variations in the TECs or in the sub-contracting arrangements with a range of contract holders. However, two alternative models can be summarised, based upon the type of contract, who has responsibility for the curriculum, and the degree to which the college co-ordinates delivery centrally – see Table 1.

To explore further the factors that contribute to the complexity of the models for delivery, the participating colleges were asked to complete a profile of their Modern Apprenticeships provision, and account for the differences between their college and others in the project. The results are discussed in Section 4.

	Model 1 ***Direct contract*** ***Supplier-driven*** ***Central co-ordination***	**Model 2** ***Subcontract*** ***Customer-driven*** ***Delegated responsibility***
Funding	College holds direct contract with TEC(s) in a range of Modern Apprenticeships	College holds subcontract with ITO
	College is paid on either number of entrants or outcomes	College is paid for training and assessment services provided
	TEC markets and recruits for the scheme in partnership with local employers and the college, including from within the college itself	ITO markets and recruits for the scheme
	College agrees the curriculum it will offer in the contract	College provides the required training and assessment in partnership with the ITO, which co-ordinates the review using its own logbooks and paperwork
Curriculum	College incorporates modern apprentices into existing programmes	College provides a Modern Apprenticeship programme on a block or day-release basis
	College provides training and assessment materials	Training materials designed and provided by the college
	College provides assessment both on the job and in the college	Assessment of college training undertaken by the college
	College provides training and assessment in key skills	Training provided is underpinning knowledge and simulation of skills not offered on-site, as well as key skills
	Curriculum is determined by existing provision	
Organisation	College centrally co-ordinates Modern Apprenticeships	Responsibility left to specialist department to negotiate, plan, organise and deliver programme
	College liaises with its departments to place modern apprentices	Contractual and funding matters dealt with by the college's finance department
	College provides review support; assessment carried out by departments offering training	

Table 1: Two models for delivering Modern Apprenticeships

3. Funding, partnerships and progression

Funding matters

Funding is a key factor in determining the way in which colleges deliver Modern Apprenticeships. Direct funding comes from TECs. Strategies used to distribute and monitor these funds vary from one TEC to another. Because of this complexity some providers avoid direct contracts with the TEC.

The range and amount of paperwork is a particular problem. However, colleges sometimes benefit from this: many SMEs do not have the resources or motivation to handle the paperwork, so are happy for the college to hold the contract. In this case the funding does not flow from the TEC to the employer, who would then subcontract the college to provide training and assessment support; instead it goes directly to the college. The college can then tell local employers what they will receive for free, and, if they need anything more, what they will have to pay for separately. Evidence from this research shows that funding from TECs is not sufficient to meet the full costs of training a modern apprentice to NVQ level 3. Colleges attempt to be as creative as possible, while avoiding being accused of double funding. They may, for example, be able to slot a modern apprentice into part of an ongoing programme in receipt of FEFC funding, to reduce costs.

Outcome funding

It may not necessarily be the funding itself that is insufficient, but the way in which it is administered and distributed, which encourages inflexibility and reduced responsiveness. In the current shift to outcome funding, colleges have to consider ways to reduce the risk of not gaining full remuneration for training costs incurred. They may only receive 25% of the fees upfront. To ensure that apprentices achieve their outcome (an NVQ level 3) and to reduce the risk of not receiving full training costs, the college may decide to recruit only those people likely to achieve at the appropriate level. This is the strategy used by colleges in the project. There is little room for taking risks. This is unfortunate, particularly since the age at which young people undertake Modern Apprenticeships is often a time of unpredictable performance. Some might seem to be a 'safe bet' at the age of 18, but through a range of social factors and emotional uncertainties may fail to sustain their performance. Others may be 'late developers', and not be given the chance to succeed on a Modern Apprenticeship. Colleges have substantial experience of teaching this age range, and would be familiar with the critical success factors to look out for on recruitment.

Another way to reduce the risk is to cut costs. Colleges in the project expressed concern about their ability to be competitive. This was not only because of the overheads large institutions have to bear compared with those of smaller-scale and specialist training organisations. The major concern was that TECs were offering contracts to providers who claimed they could deliver NVQ level 3 for significantly lower costs than colleges, particularly since TECs' own funding is dependent upon managing outcomes and reaching their targets. However, as far as TECs are concerned an NVQ level 3 achieved through a small, private training provider must be exactly the same standard as those delivered and assessed by colleges. At least two colleges in the project were concerned that their local TEC's quality assurance procedures consisted of little more than ensuring the right paperwork had been accurately filled in. In these circumstances, it is tempting for colleges, although alien to their mission, to deliver provision of a minimum quality to attain the level required. However, this was not the case in all TECs. One, in particular, was commended by the college for its thorough and helpful feedback.

Poaching is a particular problem that has come to light during the research. It is the organisation that the apprentice is registered with when completing the NVQ that receives the outcome funding. This has prompted some training providers to offer inducements to employers or employees to transfer to them just before they complete their portfolios. In one

college, the apprentices were offering themselves to other employers, who could then claim the funding for their achievement of a NVQ level 3.

Key considerations on funding

- Could colleges support local SMEs by holding the TEC contract and handling the paperwork?
- Can colleges continue to afford to add value as well as provide value for money for Modern Apprenticeships?
- Will college organisations and structures need to change in response to outcome funding?
- What can colleges do to maximise the number of modern apprentices completing?

Partnerships and competition

This project has revealed evidence of a good deal of co-operation rather than competition between providers. In the prototype project, two FE colleges were included because of their partnership with the Rover Group in developing a Modern Apprenticeship in engineering manufacture. One of those colleges was also involved in this current project, and the partnership is still going strong.

Another college in the first project had established a close working relationship with training managers, which has been sustained. One college is collaborating with its industry lead body, and together they have developed the Modern Apprenticeship framework for that industry, a specialist area in which few colleges nationally deliver an apprenticeship.

In another occupational area, where there are increasingly fewer colleges providing training for the industry, a regional consortium of colleges has been set up. Members meet regularly to share experience and developments. Because they are regional rather than local providers, they are less likely to be competing for students.

The project colleges have also shown evidence of facilitating consortia of local employers, particularly in occupational areas characterised by SMEs, for example, construction services or hairdressing. In the West Midlands, there is the Birmingham Centre for Manufacturing (BCM), and the North Worcestershire Training Group. Not only is this a good marketing strategy, but it appears that colleges which do not get involved may lose out to these consortia in the race for TEC contracts. For example, in the locality of one college, there is a large demand for training by the care sector. However, the college is unable to offer Modern Apprenticeships in care because a local consortium of care agencies and homes has set up its own training and assessment enterprise, which has captured the TEC funding for this occupational area.

Competition from lead body

In some instances, the competition is from the lead body itself, where it provides the training managers. For example, Modern Apprenticeships in travel and tourism are largely sewn up by the Association of British Travel Agents (ABTA). Colleges may come into conflict with these lead bodies. As an example, one college delivering Modern Apprenticeships feels that the Hairdressing Training Board, which it described as 'aggressive', is not encouraging the industry to fulfil the potential of a Modern Apprenticeship at NVQ level 3. It seems to the college that the board wants to lower the requirements for key skills, especially in information technology, which the college argues is an essential requirement for the industry in the 21st century. The college sees the Modern Apprenticeship as an opportunity to promote the scientific basis of the underpinning knowledge, and to raise the status of the chemistry knowledge involved in hairdressing. The industry lead body is able, through its monopoly, to resist these attempts to change the profile of hairdressing, and to marginalise the dissident voices coming from colleges. One consequence could be that a lead body is challenged by another body to become the ITO. In part, this is an attack on the lead body's NVQs rather than on Modern Apprenticeships *per se*. However, if NVQs at level 3 are perceived to have weaknesses, then so will any Modern Apprenticeship framework based on those NVQs. The college believes that it is more sinister than this, in the sense that recent reports

published by the lead body about the industry have failed to give due recognition to the contribution that colleges make to developments in learning. That the lead body has developed into a marketing organisation for the industry, and is also a joint awarding body with City and Guilds, is another cause for concern.

Where the occupational area has a long tradition of apprenticeships, such as engineering, construction and printing, the college is helping the industry to put the status back into training, and restoring a sense of pride for the apprentice. However, some employers still look back at the old apprenticeship schemes as the only genuine form of entry and training for the industry.

Partnerships with TECs

Partnerships between colleges and TECs are variable. Within the project, some colleges report strong and positive relationships built up over a number of years. In such cases, they often share the responsibilities for marketing the schemes and for recruiting modern apprentices.

This relationship is characterised by mutual respect, and the recognition that targets are most likely to be achieved by working together. Generally, these are 'model 1' providers, as outlined in Table 1 on page 15. In situations where there are less favourable attitudes towards each other, the colleges tend towards 'model 2'. This might express itself in small ways, such as the college seeking to advertise Modern Apprenticeships through its own publicity without consulting the TEC. More seriously, it could become apparent when college senior management is in conflict with the TEC on a range of issues, of which the Modern Apprenticeships is but one.

Where colleges have to deal with more than one TEC, it is the variation in TEC practices and procedures that causes them most concern (especially, as reported above, in funding matters).

Key considerations on partnerships and TECs

Do training providers:

- find problems with tracking and payments when accommodating apprentices on existing provision?
- expect cheap and quick delivery with little concern for quality apart from efficiency?
- agree that collaboration rather than competition is necessary where SMEs are being served, or where two or more colleges are in close proximity?
- attempt to provide added value; if so, who pays?
- find the status of key skills uncertain and variable?

Do TECs:

- show variation in terms of funding arrangements, and have unhelpful recording and monitoring systems (especially when colleges have to deal with more than one TEC)?
- have adequate quality assurance procedures – are there examples of good practice?
- require colleges to commit to a high-risk strategy in terms of outcome-funding and end-loaded finances?
- require colleges as training providers to be even more flexible and responsive than they already are?

Generally:

- in partnerships, do colleges believe they suffer from their own 'professionalism'?

Progression

Apprentices involved in this project showed little concern about progression, whether to employment or into higher education, since many are in the early stages of the programme. Any interest in what happens beyond NVQ level 3 is generally in terms of progression to level 4; on one programme, one apprentice while completing her level 3 portfolio was already action-planning level 4 and collecting evidence against the higher-level standards. This progression is within the workplace; so far there has been little interest expressed in moving from the Modern Apprenticeship into higher education.

However, at least three of the project colleges have carried out work on progression into higher education. Each college is a provider of

higher education courses, so has every interest in modern apprentices progressing on to higher level courses. Traditional provision of Higher National Certificates (HNCs) may be one solution, but colleges are also looking into creating more appropriate routes. The Rover scheme, involving one of the colleges in this project, has negotiated routes into higher education. There is some evidence that universities, particularly the newer ones, are offering degree programmes on a part-time basis for those who wish to stay in employment. Some of this provision is offered in partnership with FE colleges. This raised the concern among colleges in the project that unless all key skills are attained at level 3 there might be progression problems, particularly if higher education gatekeepers expect all modern apprentices to have achieved all key skills at this level.

Key considerations on progression

- **What is the role of colleges in ensuring progression within the job and into higher education?**
- **How far has higher education recognised the existence of Modern Apprenticeships as a progression route?**
- **Is there any evidence of a demand among modern apprentices for progression into higher education?**
- **Will variations in key skill specification in Modern Apprenticeship frameworks create difficulties for access to higher education in the future?**

4. Comparing college profiles

When examining responses from participating colleges about their models for delivery, pairs of colleges were identified for profile analysis. From this analysis it was hoped to identify key features in common, or main differences, to isolate which factors have the most influence on the model adopted.

Out of the 46 items on the questionnaire, 16 revealed key differences and similarities. These items were then used to compare, in more detail, the models for delivery used by these colleges.

The following analysis looks at similarities and differences between six of the 12 colleges on these 16 items, to illustrate the potential value of this profiling approach in investigating the relative significance of items in what is a complex cluster of contributing factors.

One major customer

Responses were compared from the only two colleges (denoted A and B) which answered yes to item 2 on the questionnaire and said they had one major customer for their college's Modern Apprenticeship support services. This analysis revealed that they only differed in three items (4, 6 and 35), on the key issues pulled out from

Item no.	Question	College A	College B
2	Would you say that your college has one major customer for Modern Apprenticeship support services?	✓	✓
4	Does your college hold a contract for Modern Apprenticeships with more than one TEC?	✘	✓
6	Is your college subcontracted by an employer, an employer's consortium or organisation (other than a lead body) to support a Modern Apprenticeship?	✘	✓
8	Is some of your college's funding for supporting Modern Apprenticeships output-related?	✓	✓
15	Are your college's modern apprentices predominantly employed by SMEs?	✓	✓
17	Are contracts and Modern Apprenticeships centrally co-ordinated in your college?	✓	✓
18	Does the college provide assessment only for Modern Apprenticeship schemes?	✘	✘
19	Does the college provide discrete training programmes for all its Modern Apprenticeship schemes?	✘	✘
22	Does the college accommodate some modern apprentices on existing courses?	✓	✓
23	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships on a full-time basis for any part of the scheme?	✘	✘
25	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships through day release?	✓	✓
26	Are any of the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes offered entirely in the workplace, outside the college?	✘	✘
28	Are all the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes in vocational areas already supported in the college?	✓	✓
29	Are any of the Modern Apprenticeships linked to existing GNVQ provision?	✘	✘
32	Do local employers or employer organisations have a direct involvement in designing the Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	✓	✓
35	Do all your college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes integrate key skills delivery and assessment?	✘	✓

TABLE 2: COMPARISONS OF A SAMPLE OF ITEMS, COLLEGE A AND COLLEGE B

the questionnaire; thereafter they show a similar model. Table 2 gives the profile comparison. If the fact that they had one major customer made a significant contribution to the model used, then we would expect the profiles of the two colleges to be similar. Table 3 illustrates the degree of overlap, using all 46 items.

In looking at the areas of disagreement between these two colleges, from all items on the questionnaire, it would appear that College A deals only with that customer, whereas College B has other customers as well; (Item 7: Is your college subcontracted by another training provider to provide support for a Modern Apprenticeship scheme?).

Table 3: Profile comparison between College A and College B

Agreement	Disagreement
1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 37, 43, 44, 45, 46	4, 6, 7, 14, 20, 21, 30, 31, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42

Item no.	Question	College C	College D
2	Would you say that your college has one major customer for Modern Apprenticeship support services?	✘	✘
4	Does your college hold a contract for Modern Apprenticeships with more than one TEC?	✘	✘
6	Is your college subcontracted by an employer, an employer's consortium or organisation (other than a lead body) to support a Modern Apprenticeship?	✘	✘
8	Is some of your college's funding for supporting Modern Apprenticeships output-related?	✓	✘
15	Are your college's modern apprentices predominantly employed by SMEs?	✘	✘
17	Are contracts and Modern Apprenticeships centrally co-ordinated in your college?	✓	✘
18	Does the college provide assessment only for Modern Apprenticeship schemes?	✘	✘
19	Does the college provide discrete training programmes for all its Modern Apprenticeship schemes?	✓	✘
22	Does the college accommodate some modern apprentices on existing courses?	✘	✓
23	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships on a full-time basis for any part of the scheme?	✘	✓
25	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships through day release?	✘	✓
26	Are any of the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes offered entirely in the workplace, outside the college?	✘	✓
28	Are all the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes in vocational areas already supported in the college?	✓	✓
29	Are any of the Modern Apprenticeships linked to existing GNVQ provision?	✘	✓
32	Do local employers or employer organisations have a direct involvement in designing the Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	✓	✓
35	Do all your college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes integrate key skills delivery and assessment?	✓	✓

Table 4: Comparisons of a sample of items, College C and College D

One of these two colleges is the only one to employ its modern apprentices directly, acting as employer on behalf of the industry (Item 14). Neither college offers a discrete programme for *all* its modern apprentices (Item 19), although College B does not put all of its modern apprentices on existing provision all of the time, unlike College A (Items 20 and 21). College A is one of only three colleges in the sample that allows GNVQ students to progress to a Modern Apprenticeship, and it builds its scheme around the GNVQ, unlike College B (Items 29 and 30). Modern apprentices in College B, on the other hand, are more likely to come through the Youth Training or other work training scheme routes (Item 31). Another key difference is the degree to which each college integrates key skills. College B reports integrating all key skills for all apprentices, whereas College A does not integrate any (Items 35 and 36); College A is the only one in the project that does not believe that any of its modern apprentices will achieve all key skills at the specified levels (Items 41 and 42).

This analysis points to the conclusion that having one main customer is not a significant determinant of the model of delivery adopted.

Direct contract with the TEC

A second area of differentiation in the model of delivery is whether or not colleges directly hold a TEC contract.

In the project 10 of the 12 colleges did; College C and College D did not. Again, if this is a significant factor, we might expect these two colleges to have a similar profile. Table 4 on page 21 gives a comparison of the 16 key items, with more detail given in Table 5 for all 46 items.

Agreement	Disagreement
1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 46	5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 36, 39, 40, 43, 45

Table 5: Profile comparison between College C and College D

Table 6: Profile comparison between College D and College E

Agreement	Disagreement
1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 ,38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46	3, 5, 8, 12, 18, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30, 43, 45

Table 5 would suggest that there is quite a degree of diversity between these two colleges and therefore not holding a direct TEC contract does not make a significant difference. However, some of that diversity may be due to the fact that College C was one of the 10 colleges in the project that co-ordinates modern apprentices centrally (Item 17), but the person filling in the form was not the central co-ordinator and was therefore unsure of all the answers.

Central co-ordination

Two of the 12 colleges (College D and College E) did not have a central co-ordinator, although College E does have a role that provides cross-college guidance. Otherwise, we might again expect some similarities between the models. Table 6 summarises the degree of overlap between these two colleges.

We already know that one area of difference between the two colleges is that College E directly holds a TEC contract, whereas College D is one of the two colleges in the sample that does not (Item 3). However, from Table 5 we have deduced that this factor may not be that significant an influence on the model of delivery adopted. The issue of central co-ordination is much more likely to be significant, based on the differences in Table 6. College E is also subcontracted by a lead body to provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships (Item 5). College E provides assessment only for some of its Modern Apprentices (Item 18) although unlike College D, most of that takes place outside the college (Item 27). While College D provides some full-time provision for modern apprentices, College E does not (Item 23). College E has no links with GNVQs, whereas

TABLE 8: PROFILE COMPARISON BETWEEN COLLEGE E AND COLLEGE F

Agreement	Disagreement
1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46	4, 13, 17, 26, 38

College D does (Items 29 and 30) and is the only one in the sample with such links. This analysis shows that, despite the minor differences, a delivery model based around central co-ordination will be significantly different from one which is not co-ordinated centrally.

Branching out into new areas

The other difference between these two colleges is that College E is one of only two to have undertaken Modern Apprenticeships in vocational areas new to the college (Item 28). Comparing its profile with College F – which is the other college to run a Modern Apprenticeship scheme in a vocational area in which it did not previously offer provision – will reveal whether a willingness to move into new curriculum areas to be responsive to Modern Apprenticeships is a significant issue.

Both Table 7 and 8 show that there is a remarkable degree of agreement in the profile of these two colleges. In terms of difference, we

Item no.	Question	College E	College F
2	Would you say that your college has one major customer for Modern Apprenticeship support services?	✘	✘
4	Does your college hold a contract for Modern Apprenticeships with more than one TEC?	✘	✓
6	Is your college subcontracted by an employer, an employer's consortium or organisation (other than a lead body) to support a Modern Apprenticeship?	✓	✓
8	Is some of your college's funding for supporting Modern Apprenticeships output-related?	✓	✓
15	Are your college's modern apprentices predominantly employed by SMEs?	✓	✓
17	Are contracts and Modern Apprenticeships centrally co-ordinated in your college?	✘	✓
18	Does the college provide assessment only for Modern Apprenticeship schemes?	✓	✓
19	Does the college provide discrete training programmes for all its modern apprenticeship schemes?	✘	✘
22	Does the college accommodate some modern apprentices on existing courses?	✓	✓
23	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships on a full-time basis for any part of the scheme?	✘	✘
25	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships through day release?	✓	✓
26	Are any of the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes offered entirely in the workplace, outside the college?	✓	✘
28	Are all the college 's Modern Apprenticeship schemes in vocational areas already supported in the college?	✘	✘
29	Are any of the Modern Apprenticeships linked to existing GNVQ provision?	✘	✘
32	Do local employers or employer organisations have a direct involvement in designing the Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	✓	✓
35	Do all your college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes integrate key skills delivery and assessment?	✘	✘

TABLE 7: COMPARISONS OF A SAMPLE OF ITEMS, COLLEGE E AND COLLEGE F

already know that College E is one of the two colleges which do not currently have central co-ordination (Item 17) – but it does provide cross-college guidance. College E holds a contract with one TEC, whereas College F has contracts with more than one TEC (Item 4), although College E reports that next year it is likely to be contracting with a second TEC.

College E is one of only three colleges in the project that subcontracts work to other training providers to support the delivery and assessment of the Modern Apprenticeships (Item 13). College E is also one of five colleges in the project that offers a scheme entirely run in the workplace, but College F is not one of the others (Item 26).

The fact that College E holds a contract with only one TEC, compared with others such as College F, is one significant difference in the model of delivery.

Taking on new areas of provision is a reflection of its relationship with the local TEC, as it attempts to be seen as responsive and flexible. Other colleges offer their existing provision to more than one TEC, rather than offering flexibility and responsiveness and expanding their provision to suit a specific customer.

It is too early to say whether College E will be able to continue to support Modern Apprenticeships in new and diverse curriculum areas. However, other colleges in the project were doubtful that their institution could sustain a model of delivery which is built around flexibility and responsiveness.

Profile analysis: limitations and potential

This simple comparative approach has included only half of the 12 colleges in the sample. Profiling models allows different modes of delivery to be explored in more depth, although more work is needed on the profiling tool and dimensions before it can be taken any further. A larger survey would be needed before any statistical tools could be used to analyse the relative significance of the contributing factors.

While it is not appropriate to conclude that willingness to be responsive and flexible is by itself a significant determinant of the model for delivery of Modern Apprenticeships, it is fair to say that it is an important indicator in the profile. Profiles even at this simplistic level have helped to shed further light on the key issues that influence the type of model of delivery adopted. At the very least, they have isolated areas where further discussion and research would be appropriate.

5. Next steps

This project has focused on identifying, investigating and evaluating the different models for delivering Modern Apprenticeship schemes. It has found that it is not a simple matter of identifying a number of models, since there are almost as many models as there are schemes. However, it has identified aspects of delivery across a range of occupational areas, raising a number of key issues for the FE sector to discuss further.

Areas for further investigation

Models for delivery

- Funding and contractual arrangements.
- Partnership arrangements (TECs, ITOs, lead bodies, employers and other training providers).
- Approach to curriculum and key skills.
- Balance between training and assessment.
- Prior experience of specific vocational areas and training schemes.
- Mode of delivery.
- College organisation and co-ordination of Modern Apprenticeships.
- Flexibility and responsiveness.
- Funding matters.
- Differing funding practices of TECs.
- Impact of outcome funding on the potential of the college to be responsive.
- Arguments for a single source of funding for FE initiatives and training.
- Efficiency rather than effectiveness or equity.
- Value-added provision.
- Key skills as 'bolt-on' rather than integrated.
- Possibilities of exploitation of FE and the abuse of (outcome) funding mechanisms.
- Dangers of monopoly of provision by lead bodies.

Partnerships

- Variations in TEC practices and procedures (financial and quality assurance).
- Responsiveness to and support for TEC targets.
- Role of FE in supporting SMEs.
- Involvement of employers in design, delivery and assessment of Modern Apprenticeship schemes.
- Raising employer awareness of Modern Apprenticeships, NVQs and key skills.
- Networking between colleges.
- Progression arrangements between FE and HE, including joint development (with TEC support) of key skills.

Bibliography

Armstrong, Paul (1996) Back to the future. **FEDA Bulletin.** Vol 1 No 1 June. FEDA

Department for Education and Employment (1996) TEC approaches to engaging small and medium enterprises in Modern Apprenticeships. **Quality and Performance Improvement Division Study Report.** No 48 May. DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (1995) **Insight: the magazine for education and business.** No 32 Spring. DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (1995) **Insight: the magazine for education and business.** No 33 Summer. DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (1995) **Insight: the magazine for education and business.** No 34 Autumn. DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (1996) **Insight: the magazine for education and business.** No 36 Summer. DfEE

Department for Education and Employment (1996) **Insight: the magazine for education and business.** No 37 Autumn. DfEE

National Extension College/Department for Education and Employment (1996) **Supporting Modern Apprenticeships: a flexible learning pack**. NEC

Powell, Andy (1996/97) National Training Organisations. **The Monitor.** Issue 2, Winter 96/97. National Council for Vocational Qualifications

Acronyms

ABTA – Association of British Travel Agents

BCM – Birmingham Centre for Manufacturing

BTEC – Business and Technology Education Council

CITB – Construction Industry Training Board

GNVQ – General National Vocational Qualification

HNC – Higher National Certificate

ITO – Industry Training Organisation

JTL – Joint Training Limited

NTO – National Training Organisation

NVQ – National Vocational Qualification

RWE – realistic work environment

SME – small to medium-sized enterprise

TEC – Training and Enterprise Council

Appendix 1: Numbers of current registrations of modern apprentices on schemes offered by colleges in the project

Modern Apprenticeship	National starts (13 August 1996)	Bradford and Ilkley College	Cambridge Regional College	East Birmingham College	Hastings College	Leeds College of Technology	South-East Derbyshire College	Stourbridge College	Stroud College	University College Suffolk	West Herts College	Westminster College	Writtle College	Total
Accounting	329	-	-	-	3	-	-	10	-	-	16	-	-	29
Agric. and Comm'l Hortic.	316	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Amenity Horticulture	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	3
Animal Care	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
Business Administration	3,089	-	1	-	1	0	20	6	9	-	6	-	-	43
Child Care	647	-	-	-	-	-	0	5	9	-	9	-	-	23
Construction	2,144	-	-	-	2	-	40	17	-	110	-	-	-	169
Craft Baking	n/a	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	3
Electrical Installation	1,455	-	-	60	-	0	90	0	-	-	-	-	-	150
Engineering Manufacture	5,656	-	2	184	1	-	40	53	31	-	13	-	-	324
Engineering Services	103	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
Environmental Conservation	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
Floristry	n/a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Hairdressing	1,728	-	1	-	9	-	-	-	13	-	6	-	-	29
Health Care	505	-	4	-	0	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5
Hotel and Catering	946	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	3
Information Technology	365	-	-	-	0	-	1	-	-	-	8	-	-	9
Motor Vehicle Maintenance	1,928	-	8	-	1	0	10	-	4	-	14	-	-	37
Plumbing	340	-	1	-	0	-	-	23	-	-	-	-	-	24
Printing	124	-	-	-	-	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28
Retailing	1,189	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	5
Security	15	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Sports and Recreation	99	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	11	-	-	11
Travel Services	296	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Wool Textiles	69	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30
Totals	21,367	30	23	244	17	28	201	114	67	110	88	0	11	933

0 = Programmes in planning, or programmes offered but not yet recruited.

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

		Total responses	
		YES	NO
1	Does your college support more than one Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	12	0
2	Would you say that your college has *one* major customer for Modern Apprenticeship support services?	2	9
3	Does your college hold a TEC contract to deliver Modern Apprenticeships?	10	2
4	Does your college hold a contract for Modern Apprenticeships with more than one TEC?	5	7
5	Is your college subcontracted by an Industry Lead Body or Training Organisation to support a Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	7	4
6	Is your college subcontracted by an employer, an employer's consortium or organisation (other than a lead body) to support a Modern Apprenticeship?	7	5
7	Is your college subcontracted by another training provider to provide support for a Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	9	3
8	Is *some* of your college's funding for supporting Modern Apprenticeships outcome-related?	9	3
9	Is *all* of your college's funding for supporting Modern Apprenticeships outcome-related?	3	9
10	Will *some* of your college's modern apprentices achieve NVQ level 3 in the appropriate standards?	9	2
11	Will *most* of your college's modern apprentices achieve NVQ level 3 in the appropriate standards?	10	1
12	Will *all* of your college's modern apprentices achieve NVQ level 3 in the appropriate standards?	3	7
13	Does your college contract with other training providers to support the delivery and assessment of a Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	3	8
14	Does your college employ any modern apprentices directly?	1	10
15	Are your college's modern apprentices predominantly employed by SMEs?	10	2
16	Is your college involved in supporting any consortia of local SMEs to deliver and assess Modern Apprenticeships?	3	9
17	Are contracts and Modern Apprenticeships centrally co-ordinated in your college?	10	2
18	Does the college provide *assessment only* for Modern Apprenticeship schemes?	2	10
19	Does the college provide discrete training programmes for *all* its modern apprenticeship schemes?	5	7
20	Does the college provide discrete training programmes for *some* of its modern apprenticeship schemes?	6	4
21	Does the college accommodate *all* modern apprentices on existing courses?	5	7
22	Does the college accommodate *some* modern apprentices on existing courses?	8	3
23	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships on a full-time basis for any part of the scheme?	3	9
24	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships through block release?	7	2

		Total responses	
		YES	NO
25	Does the college provide training and assessment for Modern Apprenticeships through day release?	12	0
26	Are any of the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes offered entirely in the workplace, outside the college?	5	7
27	For some Modern Apprenticeship schemes in the college is all or almost all the assessment undertaken in the college?	7	4
28	Are all the college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes in vocational areas already supported in the college?	10	2
29	Are any of the Modern Apprenticeships linked to existing GNVQ provision?	1	9
30	Have any of your college's modern apprentices progressed through a GNVQ route?	3	8
31	Have any of your college's modern apprentices progressed through youth training or work training schemes?	9	1
32	Do local employers or employer organisations have a direct involvement in *designing* the Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	9	3
33	Do local employers or employer organisations have a direct involvement in the *delivery* of the Modern Apprenticeship scheme?	4	3
34	Do *some* of your college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes integrate key skills delivery and assessment?	11	1
35	Do *all* your college's Modern Apprenticeship schemes integrate key skills delivery and assessment?	3	7
36	Is *some* of the key skills provision for Modern Apprenticeships offered through open and flexible learning?	10	1
37	Is *all* of the key skills provision for Modern Apprenticeships in your college offered through open and flexible learning?	1	10
38	In *some* of the Modern Apprenticeship schemes supported by your college do the frameworks specify *some* key skills at level 3?	9	1
39	In *some* of the Modern Apprenticeship schemes supported by your college do the frameworks specify *all* key skills at level 3?	6	3
40	In *all* of the Modern Apprenticeship schemes supported by your college do the frameworks specify *all* key skills at level 3?	1	8
41	Will *some* of your college's modern apprentices achieve *some* of the specified key skills at the appropriate levels?	10	1
42	Will *some* of your college's modern apprentices achieve *all* the specified key skills at the appropriate levels?	10	1
43	Will *all* of your college's modern apprentices achieve *all* the specified key skills at the appropriate levels?	3	8
44	Will *some* of your college's modern apprentices progress into higher education?	8	4
45	Will *most* of your college's modern apprentices progress into higher education?	1	10
46	Will *all* of your college's modern apprentices progress into higher education?	0	12

FEDA publication series

Developing FE: Volume 1

1. Student tracking
2. Caseloading
3. Assessing the impact: provision for learners with learning difficulties and disabilities
4. Adults and GNVQs
5. On course for next steps: careers education and guidance for students in FE
6. Marketing planning
7. Managing change in FE
8. The effective college library
9. Appraisal in FE – where are we now?
10. Clarity is power: learning outcomes and course design

FE Matters: Volume 1

1. Environmental education in FE: part 1
2. Environmental education in FE: part 2
3. Towards self-assessing colleges
4. Colleges working with industry
5. Evidence for action: papers prepared for FEFC's Learning and Technology Committee
6. Student retention: case studies of strategies that work
7. Getting the credit: OCN accreditation and learners with learning difficulties and disabilities
8. Moving on from Key Stage 4: the challenges for FE
9. Monitoring student attendance
10. Educational Psychologists in FE
11. Assuring coherence in individual learning programmes
12. Adult learners: pathways to progression
13. A real job with prospects: supported employment opportunities for adults with disabilities or learning difficulties
14. Transforming teaching: selecting and evaluating teaching strategies
15. Information and learning technology: a development handbook
16. Delivering Modern Apprenticeships
17. Planning a merger of FE colleges
18. Tackling drugs together: addressing the issues in the FE sector
19. Security is not an option – learning in a safe environment
20. Give us the credit: achieving a comprehensive FE framework

FEDA bulletins: Volume 1

1. Developing college strategies for Human Resource Development
2. Enhancing GCE A-level programmes
3. Impact of voucher schemes on the FE curriculum
4. Quality assurance in colleges
5. Maintaining quality during curriculum change
6. Action planning and recording achievement
7. Implementing modular A level
8. Comparing content in selected GCE A levels and Advanced GNVQs
9. Engineering the future
10. Charters in FE: Making them work
11. Access to accreditation
12. Back to the future: Modern Apprenticeship schemes
13. Competing for business: colleges and the Competitiveness Fund
14. Developing an information strategy for a college
15. Strategic approaches to processes, cultures and structures

FE MATTERS

FEDA paper

Price: £6.50

ISSN 1361 - 9977

BEST COPY AVAILABLE